



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/050,625	01/16/2002	Paul Dvorkis	04873-074002	7569
26161	7590	01/12/2004	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON PC 225 FRANKLIN ST BOSTON, MA 02110			FRECH, KARL D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2876	

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1. Applicant's response received 10/23/03 has been entered.
2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(f) he did not himself invent the subject matter sought to be patented.

3. Claims 13,14,15,16,17 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) because the applicant did not invent the claimed subject matter. Applicant admits in the current specification that subject matter which is shown in figures 1,6 and 7. Figure 1 shows an optical indicia scanner with a laser light source 12 which creates a light beam with a non-circularly-symmetric cross section with an x-axis component of the light beam and a y-axis component of the light beam being differently divergent (fig 7). Figure 1 also shows a negative beam-shaping optical element in the part cylindrical concave mirror 32, which as shown in the figure has an axis parallel to the x-axis of the light beam.

Applicant admits on page 14 line 7 that gain guided lasers are prior art.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under

37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 18, 19 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's admitted prior art. Applicant admits to that which is shown above.

Applicant does not admit to the index guided laser. However, index guided lasers are old and well known. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use an index guided laser instead of the gain guided laser. Since both were known, and since there is no criticality disclosed within the specification, these two would be operational equivalents. Applicant admits as seen in figure 7 that it is known that the x-axis beam waste and the y-axis beam waste are at different distances from the source. Applicant does not admit that the x-axis beam waste is further from the source than the y-axis beam waste. This, however, is merely reorienting the axis of the optical elements within between the light source and the detector. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to reorient the optical elements in order to achieve the most efficient operation.

6. Claim 20 remains objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. Applicant's arguments filed 10/23/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

8. Applicant argues that the admitted prior art does not teach that the x-axis divergence is greater than the y-axis divergence. The examiner disagrees. As seen in Figure 7, labeled prior art, at point W_y at a distance d_f from the source, the x axis divergence is greater than the y axis divergence. There is currently no claim limitation which would negate this interpretation.

9. Applicant also argues that the examiner's position that the concave mirror 32 shows a negative beam-shaping optics in the beam path "misses the point" because mirror 32 is a collection mirror and not in the beam path. The examiner disagrees, as seen in Figure 1, labeled prior art, concave "collection" mirror 32 is, indeed, in the beam path. The beam path may rightfully be interpreted to include outgoing path 20 and return path 30. There is currently no claim limitation suggests that the claimed path cannot include the return path.


10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karl D Frech whose telephone number is (703) 305 3491. As of January 15, 2004, the examiner's new telephone number will be (571) 272-2390. The examiner can normally be reached on maxi-flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G Lee can be reached on (703) 305 3503. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872 9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308 0956.



Karl D Frech
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2876
